

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

Rule ¹	Model Rule change	Proposed for Arizona?
1.0(n) (definition of writing or written)	(n) "Writing" or "written" denotes a tangible or electronic record of a communication or representation, including handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photography, audio or videorecording, and e-mail <u>electronic communications</u> . A "signed" writing includes an electronic sound, symbol or process attached to or logically associated with a writing and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the writing.	Yes
1.0 comment 9 (dealing with screening)	To implement, reinforce and remind all affected lawyers of the presence of the screening, it may be appropriate for the firm to undertake such procedures as a written undertaking by the screened lawyer to avoid any communication with other firm personnel and any contact with any firm files or other materials information , <u>including information in electronic form</u> , relating to the matter, written notice and instructions to all other firm personnel forbidding any communication with the screened lawyer relating to the matter, denial of access by the screened lawyer to firm files or other materials information , <u>including information in electronic form</u> , relating to the matter, and periodic	Yes

¹ Model Rules of Professional Conduct, unless otherwise noted.

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	reminders of the screen to the screened lawyer and all other firm personnel.	
1.1 (competence) amends former comment 6, now comment 8	<p>Maintaining Competence</p> <p>[6 8] To maintain the requisite knowledge and skill, a lawyer should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, <u>including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology</u>, engage in continuing study and education and comply with all continuing legal education requirements to which the lawyer is subject.</p>	Yes
1.1 (competence) adds new comments 6 and 7	<p>Retaining or Contracting With Other Lawyers</p> <p><u>[6] Before a lawyer retains or contracts with other lawyers outside the lawyer's own firm to provide or assist in the provision of legal services to a client, the lawyer should ordinarily obtain informed consent from the client and must reasonably believe that the other lawyers' services will contribute to the competent and ethical representation of the client. See also Rules 1.2 (allocation of authority), 1.4 (communication with client), 1.5(e) (fee sharing), 1.6 (confidentiality), and 5.5(a) (unauthorized practice of law). The reasonableness of the decision to retain or contract with other lawyers outside the lawyer's own firm will depend upon the</u></p>	<p>No. Explanation in petition:</p> <p>"These comments largely echo obligations already imposed by other ERs (e.g., ERs 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 5.5, which are specifically listed in the new comment 6 to Model Rule 1.1). To the extent these comments differ from those obligations, they would create confusion by suggesting in comments that there are obligations different than those set forth in other ERs. Accordingly, these comments are not necessary given the current ERs and could create mischief if adopted. For these reasons, adoption of these comments is not recommended."</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>circumstances, including the education, experience and reputation of the nonfirm lawyers; the nature of the services assigned to the nonfirm lawyers; and the legal protections, professional conduct rules, and ethical environments of the jurisdictions in which the services will be performed, particularly relating to confidential information.</u></p> <p><u>[7] When lawyers from more than one law firm are providing legal services to the client on a particular matter, the lawyers ordinarily should consult with each other and the client about the scope of their respective representations and the allocation of responsibility among them. See Rule 1.2. When making allocations of responsibility in a matter pending before a tribunal, lawyers and parties may have additional obligations that are a matter of law beyond the scope of these Rules.</u></p>	
1.4 (communication) comment 4 amended	<p>[4] A lawyer's regular communication with clients will minimize the occasions on which a client will need to request information concerning the representation. When a client makes a reasonable request for information, however, paragraph (a)(4) requires prompt compliance with the request, or if a prompt response is not feasible, that the lawyer, or a member of</p>	Yes

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	the lawyer's staff, acknowledge receipt of the request and advise the client when a response may be expected. Client telephone calls should be promptly returned or acknowledged. <u>A lawyer should promptly respond to or acknowledge client communications.</u>	
1.6 (confidentiality) Adds permissive disclosure	(7) to detect and resolve conflicts of interest arising from the lawyer's change of employment or from changes in the composition or ownership of a firm, but only if the revealed information would not compromise the attorney-client privilege or otherwise prejudice the client.	Yes. Would be ER 1.6(d)(7).
1.6 (confidentiality) New comments related to new permissive disclosure	<u>Detection of Conflicts of Interest</u> <u>[13] Paragraph (b)(7) recognizes that lawyers in different firms may need to disclose limited information to each other to detect and resolve conflicts of interest, such as when a lawyer is considering an association with another firm, two or more firms are considering a merger, or a lawyer is considering the purchase of a law practice. See Rule 1.17, Comment [7]. Under these circumstances, lawyers and law firms are permitted to disclose limited information, but only once substantive discussions regarding the new relationship have occurred. Any such disclosure should</u>	Yes, with a minor change. Instead of "once substantive discussions regarding the new relationship have occurred," recommends "only when there is a reasonable possibility that a new relationship might be established."

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>ordinarily include no more than the identity of the persons and entities involved in a matter, a brief summary of the general issues involved, and information about whether the matter has terminated. Even this limited information, however, should be disclosed only to the extent reasonably necessary to detect and resolve conflicts of interest that might arise from the possible new relationship. Moreover, the disclosure of any information is prohibited if it would compromise the attorney-client privilege or otherwise prejudice the client (e.g., the fact that a corporate client is seeking advice on a corporate takeover that has not been publicly announced; that a person has consulted a lawyer about the possibility of divorce before the person's intentions are known to the person's spouse; or that a person has consulted a lawyer about a criminal investigation that has not led to a public charge). Under those circumstances, paragraph (a) prohibits disclosure unless the client or former client gives informed consent. A lawyer's fiduciary duty to the lawyer's firm may also govern a lawyer's conduct when exploring an association with another firm and is beyond the scope of these Rules.</u></p> <p><u>[14] Any information disclosed pursuant to paragraph (b)(7) may be used or further</u></p>	
--	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<u>disclosed only to the extent necessary to detect and resolve conflicts of interest. Paragraph (b)(7) does not restrict the use of information acquired by means independent of any disclosure pursuant to paragraph (b)(7). Paragraph (b)(7) also does not affect the disclosure of information within a law firm when the disclosure is otherwise authorized, see Comment [5], such as when a lawyer in a firm discloses information to another lawyer in the same firm to detect and resolve conflicts of interest that could arise in connection with undertaking a new representation.</u>	
1.6 (confidentiality) Adds new direction to safeguard information	<u>(c) A lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client.</u>	Yes. Would be ER 1.6(e).
1.6 (confidentiality) Revises comment related to safeguarding information	Acting Competently to Preserve Confidentiality [186] <u>Paragraph (c) requires a A lawyer must to act competently to safeguard information relating to the representation of a client against unauthorized access by third parties and against</u> inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure by the lawyer or other persons who are participating in the representation of the client or who are	Yes.

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>subject to the lawyer's supervision. See Rules 1.1, 5.1 and 5.3. <u>The unauthorized access to, or the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, information relating to the representation of a client does not constitute a violation of paragraph (c) if the lawyer has made reasonable efforts to prevent the access or disclosure. Factors to be considered in determining the reasonableness of the lawyer's efforts include, but are not limited to, the sensitivity of the information, the likelihood of disclosure if additional safeguards are not employed, the cost of employing additional safeguards, the difficulty of implementing the safeguards, and the extent to which the safeguards adversely affect the lawyer's ability to represent clients (e.g., by making a device or important piece of software excessively difficult to use). A client may require the lawyer to implement special security measures not required by this Rule or may give informed consent to forgo security measures that would otherwise be required by this Rule. Whether a lawyer may be required to take additional steps to safeguard a client's information in order to comply with other law, such as state and federal laws that govern data privacy or that impose notification requirements upon the loss of, or unauthorized access to, electronic information, is beyond the scope</u></p>	
--	--	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<u>of these Rules. For a lawyer's duties when sharing information with nonlawyers outside the lawyer's own firm, see Rule 5.3, Comments [3]-[4].</u>	
1.6 (confidentiality) New language in comment relating to safeguarding client information	[197] When transmitting a communication that includes information relating to the representation of a client, the lawyer must take reasonable precautions to prevent the information from coming into the hands of unintended recipients. This duty, however, does not require that the lawyer use special security measures if the method of communication affords a reasonable expectation of privacy. Special circumstances, however, may warrant special precautions. Factors to be considered in determining the reasonableness of the lawyer's expectation of confidentiality include the sensitivity of the information and the extent to which the privacy of the communication is protected by law or by a confidentiality agreement. A client may require the lawyer to implement special security measures not required by this Rule or may give informed consent to the use of a means of communication that would otherwise be prohibited by this Rule. <u>Whether a lawyer may be required to take additional steps in order to comply with other law, such as state and federal laws that govern data privacy, is beyond the</u>	Yes

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<u>scope of these Rules.</u>	
1.17 (sale of law practice) Adds clarifying language in comment	[7] Negotiations between seller and prospective purchaser prior to disclosure of information relating to a specific representation of an identifiable client no more violate the confidentiality provisions of Model Rule 1.6 than do preliminary discussions concerning the possible association of another lawyer or mergers between firms, with respect to which client consent is not required. <u>See Rule 1.6(b)(7).</u> Providing the purchaser access to client-specific <u>detailed</u> information relating to the representation, and to such as the client's file, however, requires client consent. The Rule provides that before such information can be disclosed by the seller to the purchaser the client must be given actual written notice of the contemplated sale, including the identity of the purchaser, and must be told that the decision to consent or make other arrangements must be made within 90 days. If nothing is heard from the client within that time, consent to the sale is presumed.	Yes
1.18 (duties to prospective client)	(a) A person who discusses <u>consults</u> with a lawyer <u>about</u> the possibility of forming a client-lawyer relationship with respect to a matter is a prospective client. (b) Even when no client-lawyer relationship	Yes, but proposed ER 1.18(b) is slightly (non-substantively) different: (b) Even when no client-lawyer relationship ensues, a lawyer who has had discussions

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	ensues, a lawyer who has had discussions with <u>learned information from</u> a prospective client shall not use or reveal <u>that</u> information learned in the consultation , except as Rule 1.9 would permit with respect to information of a former client.	with <u>learned information from</u> a prospective client shall not use or reveal <u>that</u> information learned in the consultation , except as <u>would be permitted by ER 1.6 or by ER 1.9 with respect to information of a former client.</u>
1.18 (duties to prospective client) Adds to comments	<p>[1] Prospective clients, like clients, may disclose information to a lawyer, place documents or other property in the lawyer's custody, or rely on the lawyer's advice. A lawyer's discussions <u>consultations</u> with a prospective client usually are limited in time and depth and leave both the prospective client and the lawyer free (and sometimes required) to proceed no further. Hence, prospective clients should receive some but not all of the protection afforded clients.</p> <p>[2] Not all persons who communicate information to a lawyer are entitled to protection under this Rule. A person <u>becomes a prospective client by consulting with a lawyer about the possibility of forming a client-lawyer relationship with respect to a matter. Whether</u> <u>communications, including written, oral, or electronic communications, constitute a consultation depends on the</u> <u>circumstances. For example, a consultation is likely to have occurred if a lawyer, either in person or through the lawyer's</u></p>	Yes

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>advertising in any medium, specifically requests or invites the submission of information about a potential representation without clear and reasonably understandable warnings and cautionary statements that limit the lawyer's obligations, and a person provides information in response. See also Comment [4]. In contrast, a consultation does not occur if a person provides information to a lawyer in response to advertising that merely describes the lawyer's education, experience, areas of practice, and contact information, or provides legal information of general interest. A person who communicates. Such a person communicates information unilaterally to a lawyer, without any reasonable expectation that the lawyer is willing to discuss the possibility of forming a client-lawyer relationship, and is thus not a "prospective client," within the meaning of paragraph (a). Moreover, a person who communicates with a lawyer for the purpose of disqualifying the lawyer is not a "prospective client."</u></p> <p>[4] In order to avoid acquiring disqualifying information from a prospective client, a lawyer considering whether or not to undertake a new matter should limit the initial interview <u>the initial consultation</u> to</p>	
--	--	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>only such information as reasonably appears necessary for that purpose. Where the information indicates that a conflict of interest or other reason for non-representation exists, the lawyer should so inform the prospective client or decline the representation. If the prospective client wishes to retain the lawyer, and if consent is possible under Rule 1.7, then consent from all affected present or former clients must be obtained before accepting the representation.</p> <p>[5] A lawyer may condition conversations <u>a consultation</u> with a prospective client on the person's informed consent that no information disclosed during the consultation will prohibit the lawyer from representing a different client in the matter. See Rule 1.0(e) for the definition of informed consent. If the agreement expressly so provides, the prospective client may also consent to the lawyer's subsequent use of information received from the prospective client.</p>	
<p>4.4 (respect for rights of third persons) Adds phrase to rule</p>	<p>(b) A lawyer who receives a document <u>or electronically stored information</u> relating to the representation of the lawyer's client and knows or reasonably should know that the document <u>or electronically stored information</u> was inadvertently sent shall</p>	<p>Yes as far as adding "or electronically stored information" after "document." ER 4.4(b) includes non-model rule language that is not affected by these changes.</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	promptly notify the sender.	
4.4 (respect for rights of third persons) adds references to “electronically stored information” and other clarifications to comments	<p>[2] Paragraph (b) recognizes that lawyers sometimes receive <u>a documents or electronically stored information that were</u> was mistakenly sent or produced by opposing parties or their lawyers. <u>A document or electronically stored information is inadvertently sent when it is accidentally transmitted, such as when an email or letter is misaddressed or a document or electronically stored information is accidentally included with information that was intentionally transmitted.</u> If a lawyer knows or reasonably should know that such a document <u>or electronically stored information</u> was sent inadvertently, then this Rule requires the lawyer to promptly notify the sender in order to permit that person to take protective measures. Whether the lawyer is required to take additional steps, such as returning the <u>document or electronically stored information</u> original document, is a matter of law beyond the scope of these Rules, as is the question of whether the privileged status of a document <u>or electronically stored information</u> has been waived. Similarly, this Rule does not address the legal duties of a lawyer who receives a document <u>or electronically stored</u></p>	<p>Yes, as far as adding “electronically stored information” and making some other changes. Because Arizona’s ER 4.4(b) is different from the model rule, our comment already included different language. The proposed comment 2 therefore includes a different third sentence:</p> <p>“If a lawyer knows or reasonably should know that such a document <u>or electronically stored information</u> was sent inadvertently, then this Rule requires the lawyer to stop reading the document, to make no use of the document, and to promptly notify the sender in order to permit that person to take protective measures.”</p> <p>Instead of the last sentence of comment 2, this sentence is proposed:</p> <p><u>“A receiving lawyer who discovers metadata embedded within a document or electronically stored communication and who knows or reasonably should know that the metadata reveals confidential or privileged information has a duty to comply with the procedures set forth in ER 4.4(b).”</u></p> <p>Comment 3 is recommended as amended.</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>information</u> that the lawyer knows or reasonably should know may have been wrongfully <u>inappropriately</u> obtained by the sending person. For purposes of this Rule, “document <u>or electronically stored information</u>” includes, <u>in addition to paper documents, email and other forms of electronically stored information, including embedded data (commonly referred to as “metadata”), that is email or other electronic modes of transmission</u> subject to being read or put into readable form. <u>Metadata in electronic documents creates an obligation under this Rule only if the receiving lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the metadata was inadvertently sent to the receiving lawyer.</u></p> <p>[3] Some lawyers may choose to return a document <u>or delete electronically stored information</u> unread, for example, when the lawyer learns before receiving it the document that it was inadvertently sent to the wrong address. Where a lawyer is not required by applicable law to do so, the decision to voluntarily return such a document <u>or delete electronically stored information</u> is a matter of professional judgment ordinarily reserved to the lawyer. See Rules 1.2 and 1.4.</p>	
5.3 (responsibilities)	[21] Paragraph (a) requires lawyers with	Yes, except for the reference to MR 1.1,

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

<p>regarding nonlawyer assistance) Title changed (from “assistants”); comments 1 and 2 revised and swapped</p>	<p>managerial authority within a law firm to make reasonable efforts to establish internal policies and procedures designed to provide to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that nonlawyers in the firm <u>and nonlawyers outside the firm who work on firm matters</u> will act in a way compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer. with the Rules of Professional Conduct. See Comment [6] to Rule 1.1 (retaining lawyers outside the firm) and Comment [1] to Rule 5.1. (responsibilities with respect to lawyers within a firm). Paragraph (b) applies to lawyers who have supervisory authority over the work of a nonlawyer. <u>such nonlawyers within or outside the firm.</u> Paragraph (c) specifies the circumstances in which a lawyer is responsible for <u>the</u> conduct of a nonlawyer <u>such nonlawyers within or outside the firm</u> that would be a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct if engaged in by a lawyer.</p>	<p>comment 6, which the State Bar is not recommending.</p>
<p>5.3 (responsibilities regarding nonlawyer assistance) Adds two new comments relating to nonlawyers outside firm</p>	<p><u>Nonlawyers Outside the Firm</u></p> <p><u>[3] A lawyer may use nonlawyers outside the firm to assist the lawyer in rendering legal services to the client. Examples include the retention of an investigative or paraprofessional service, hiring a document</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>management company to create and maintain a database for complex litigation, sending client documents to a third party for printing or scanning, and using an Internet-based service to store client information. When using such services outside the firm, a lawyer must make reasonable efforts to ensure that the services are provided in a manner that is compatible with the lawyer's professional obligations. The extent of this obligation will depend upon the circumstances, including the education, experience and reputation of the nonlawyer; the nature of the services involved; the terms of any arrangements concerning the protection of client information; and the legal and ethical environments of the jurisdictions in which the services will be performed, particularly with regard to confidentiality. See also Rules 1.1 (competence), 1.2 (allocation of authority), 1.4 (communication with client), 1.6 (confidentiality), 5.4(a) (professional independence of the lawyer), and 5.5(a) (unauthorized practice of law). When retaining or directing a nonlawyer outside the firm, a lawyer should communicate directions appropriate under the circumstances to give reasonable assurance that the nonlawyer's conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer.</u></p>	
--	--	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>[4] Where the client directs the selection of a particular nonlawyer service provider outside the firm, the lawyer ordinarily should agree with the client concerning the allocation of responsibility for monitoring as between the client and the lawyer. See Rule 1.2. When making such an allocation in a matter pending before a tribunal, lawyers and parties may have additional obligations that are a matter of law beyond the scope of these Rules.</u></p>	
5.5 (unauthorized practice of law)	<p>(d) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction <u>or in a foreign jurisdiction</u>, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction <u>or the equivalent thereof</u>, may <u>provide legal services through an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction that</u> provide legal services in this jurisdiction that: (1) are provided to the lawyer's employer or its organizational affiliates; and are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; <u>and, when performed by a foreign lawyer and requires advice on concern the law of this or another U.S. jurisdiction or of the United States, such advice shall be based upon the advice of a lawyer who is duly licensed and authorized by the jurisdiction to provide such advice; or</u></p>	<p>No ER 5.5 changes are being recommended because the State Bar's petition does not address admission or eligibility-to-practice rules.</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>(2) are services that the lawyer is authorized by federal or other law <u>or Rule</u> to provide in this jurisdiction.</p> <p><u>(e) For purposes of paragraph (d), the foreign lawyer must be a member in good standing of a recognized legal profession in a foreign jurisdiction, the members of which are admitted to practice as lawyers or counselors at law or the equivalent, and are subject to effective regulation and discipline by a duly constituted professional body or a public authority.</u></p>	
<p>5.5 (unauthorized practice of law) Adds to comments</p>	<p>[1] A lawyer may practice law only in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice. A lawyer may be admitted to practice law in a jurisdiction on a regular basis or may be authorized by court rule or order or by law to practice for a limited purpose or on a restricted basis. Paragraph (a) applies to unauthorized practice of law by a lawyer, whether through the lawyer's direct action or by the lawyer assisting another person. <u>For example, a lawyer may not assist a person in practicing law in violation of the rules governing professional conduct in that person's jurisdiction.</u></p> <p>[4] Other than as authorized by law or this Rule, a lawyer who is not admitted to</p>	<p>Because Arizona did not adopt the bulk of the MR 5.5 comments to begin with, the model rule changes have no corresponding home in Arizona's comment.</p> <p>The State Bar is recommending, however, that the court add to Arizona's comment a pre-existing sentence from the model rule comment:</p> <p><u>[1] Paragraph (a) applies to unauthorized practice of law by a lawyer, whether through the lawyer's direct action or by the lawyer assisting another person.</u> The definition of the practice of law is established by law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to members of the bar protects the</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>practice generally in this jurisdiction violates paragraph (b)(1) if the lawyer establishes an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law. Presence may be systematic and continuous even if the lawyer is not physically present here. Such a lawyer must not hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction. See also Rules 7.1(a) and 7.5(b).</p> <p>...</p> <p>[18] Paragraph (d)(2) recognizes that a lawyer may provide legal services in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed when authorized to do so by federal or other law, which includes statute, court rule, executive regulation or judicial precedent. <u>See, e.g., The ABA Model Rule on Practice Pending Admission.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>[21] Paragraphs (c) and (d) do not authorize communications advertising legal services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction by lawyers who are admitted to practice in other jurisdictions. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction is governed by Rules 7.1 to 7.5.</p>	<p>public against rendition of legal services by unqualified persons. Paragraph (b) does not prohibit a lawyer from employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. See ER 5.3. Likewise, it does not prohibit lawyers from providing professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of law, for example, claims adjusters, employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants and persons employed in government agencies. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed pro se.</p>
--	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

7.1 (communications concerning a lawyer's services)	[3] An advertisement that truthfully reports a lawyer's achievements on behalf of clients or former clients may be misleading if presented so as to lead a reasonable person to form an unjustified expectation that the same results could be obtained for other clients in similar matters without reference to the specific factual and legal circumstances of each client's case. Similarly, an unsubstantiated comparison of the lawyer's services or fees with the services or fees of other lawyers may be misleading if presented with such specificity as would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the comparison can be substantiated. The inclusion of an appropriate disclaimer or qualifying language may preclude a finding that a statement is likely to create unjustified expectations or otherwise mislead <u>the public</u> . a prospective client.	Yes
7.2 (advertising)	[1] To assist the public in <u>learning about and</u> obtaining legal services, lawyers should be allowed to make known their services not only through reputation but also through organized information campaigns in the form of advertising. Advertising involves an active quest for clients, contrary to the tradition that a lawyer should not seek clientele. However, the public's need to know about legal	Yes, except that in comment 5, proposes revising one sentence: <u>"Moreover, a lawyer may pay others for generating client leads, such as Internet-based client leads "as long as the lead generator is consistent with Rules 1.5(e) (division of fees) and 5.4 (professional independence of the lawyer), and the lead generator's communications are consistent</u>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>services can be fulfilled in part through advertising. This need is particularly acute in the case of persons of moderate means who have not made extensive use of legal services. The interest in expanding public information about legal services ought to prevail over tradition. Nevertheless, advertising by lawyers entails the risk of practices that are misleading or overreaching.</p> <p>[2] This Rule permits public dissemination of information concerning a lawyer's name or firm name, address, <u>email address, website, and telephone number</u>; the kinds of services the lawyer will undertake; the basis on which the lawyer's fees are determined, including prices for specific services and payment and credit arrangements; a lawyer's foreign language ability; names of references and, with their consent, names of clients regularly represented; and other information that might invite the attention of those seeking legal assistance.</p> <p>[3] Questions of effectiveness and taste in advertising are matters of speculation and subjective judgment. Some jurisdictions have had extensive prohibitions against television <u>and other forms of</u> advertising, against advertising</p>	<p><u>with Rule 7.1 (communications concerning a lawyer's services)."</u></p>
--	---	---

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>going beyond specified facts about a lawyer, or against "undignified" advertising. <u>Television, the Internet, and other forms of electronic communication are</u> is now one of <u>among</u> the most powerful media for getting information to the public, particularly persons of low and moderate income; prohibiting television, Internet, and other forms of electronic advertising, therefore, would impede the flow of information about legal services to many sectors of the public. Limiting the information that may be advertised has a similar effect and assumes that the bar can accurately forecast the kind of information that the public would regard as relevant. Similarly, electronic media, such as the Internet, can be an important source of information about legal services, and lawful communication by electronic mail is permitted by this Rule. But see Rule 7.3(a) for the prohibition against the <u>a</u> solicitation of a prospective client through a real-time electronic exchange <u>initiated by the lawyer</u>. That is not initiated by the prospective client.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer</p> <p>[5] <u>Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1)-(b)(4)</u>, Llawyers are not permitted to pay others for channeling</p>	
--	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>professional work recommending the lawyer's services or for channeling professional work in a manner that violates Rule 7.3. A communication contains a recommendation if it endorses or vouches for a lawyer's credentials, abilities, competence, character, or other professional qualities.</u> Paragraph (b)(1), however, allows a lawyer to pay for advertising and communications permitted by this Rule, including the costs of print directory listings, on-line directory listings, newspaper ads, television and radio airtime, domain-name registrations, sponsorship fees, banner ads, <u>Internet-based advertisements</u>, and group advertising. A lawyer may compensate employees, agents and vendors who are engaged to provide marketing or client development services, such as publicists, public-relations personnel, business development staff and website designers. <u>Moreover, a lawyer may pay others for generating client leads, such as Internet-based client leads, as long as the lead generator does not recommend the lawyer, any payment to the lead generator is consistent with Rules 1.5(e) (division of fees) and 5.4 (professional independence of the lawyer), and the lead generator's communications are consistent with Rule 7.1 (communications concerning a lawyer's</u></p>	
--	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p><u>services</u>). To comply with Rule 7.1, a lawyer must not pay a lead generator that <u>states, implies, or creates a reasonable impression that it is recommending the lawyer, is making the referral without payment from the lawyer, or has analyzed a person's legal problems when determining which lawyer should receive the referral</u>. See also Rule 5.3 for the (duties of lawyers and law firms with respect to the conduct of nonlawyers); Rule 8.4(a) (duty to avoid violating the Rules <u>through the acts of another</u>). who prepare marketing materials for them.</p> <p>[6] A lawyer may pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service. A legal service plan is a prepaid or group legal service plan or a similar delivery system that assists people who seek prospective clients to secure legal representation. A lawyer referral service, on the other hand, is any organization that holds itself out to the public as a lawyer referral service. Such referral services are understood by laypersons <u>the public</u> to be consumer-oriented organizations that provide unbiased referrals to lawyers with appropriate experience in the subject matter of the representation and afford other client protections, such as complaint</p>	
--	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>procedures or malpractice insurance requirements. Consequently, this Rule only permits a lawyer to pay the usual charges of a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service. A qualified lawyer referral service is one that is approved by an appropriate regulatory authority as affording adequate protections for <u>the public</u>. prospective clients. See, e.g., the American Bar Association's Model Supreme Court Rules Governing Lawyer Referral Services and Model Lawyer Referral and Information Service Quality Assurance Act (requiring that organizations that are identified as lawyer referral services (i) permit the participation of all lawyers who are licensed and eligible to practice in the jurisdiction and who meet reasonable objective eligibility requirements as may be established by the referral service for the protection of <u>the public</u> prospective clients; (ii) require each participating lawyer to carry reasonably adequate malpractice insurance; (iii) act reasonably to assess client satisfaction and address client complaints; and (iv) do not <u>make referrals</u> prospective clients to lawyers who own, operate or are employed by the referral service).</p> <p>[7] A lawyer who accepts assignments or referrals from a legal service plan or</p>	
--	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>referrals from a lawyer referral service must act reasonably to assure that the activities of the plan or service are compatible with the lawyer's professional obligations. See Rule 5.3. Legal service plans and lawyer referral services may communicate with prospective clients <u>the public</u>, but such communication must be in conformity with these Rules. Thus, advertising must not be false or misleading, as would be the case if the communications of a group advertising program or a group legal services plan would mislead <u>the public</u> prospective clients to think that it was a lawyer referral service sponsored by a state agency or bar association. Nor could the lawyer allow in-person, telephonic, or real-time contacts that would violate Rule 7.3.</p>	
<p>7.3 (solicitation of clients) Title and rule changed to eliminate references to prospective clients</p>	<p>(Rule 7.3 Direct Contact with Prospective <u>Solicitation of Clients</u>)</p> <p>a) A lawyer shall not by in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact, solicit professional employment from a prospective client when a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's pecuniary gain, unless the person contacted:</p> <p>(1) is a lawyer; or</p> <p>(2) has a family, close personal, or prior professional relationship with</p>	<p>Yes, but inserts "the person contacted" for "prospective client" in 7.3(a).</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>the lawyer.</p> <p>(b) A lawyer shall not solicit professional employment from a prospective client by written, recorded or electronic communication or by in-person, telephone or real-time electronic contact even when not otherwise prohibited by paragraph (a), if:</p> <p>(1) the prospective client <u>target of the solicitation</u> has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer; or</p> <p>(2) the solicitation involves coercion, duress or harassment.</p> <p>(c) Every written, recorded or electronic communication from a lawyer soliciting professional employment from <u>anyone</u> a prospective client known to be in need of legal services in a particular matter shall include the words "Advertising Material" on the outside envelope, if any, and at the beginning and ending of any recorded or electronic communication, unless the recipient of the communication is a person specified in paragraphs (a)(1) or (a)(2).</p>	
<p>7.3 (solicitation of clients)</p> <p>Adds a new comment clarifying what constitutes target advertising; continues to eliminate use</p>	<p><u>[1] A solicitation is a targeted communication initiated by the lawyer that is directed to a specific person and that offers to provide, or can reasonably be understood as offering to provide, legal</u></p>	<p>Yes, and adds this sentence to the end of the comment 2: "See Rule 8.4 (duty to avoid violating the Rules through the actions of another)."</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

of “prospective client”	<p><u>services. In contrast, a lawyer’s communication typically does not constitute a solicitation if it is directed to the general public, such as through a billboard, an Internet banner advertisement, a website or a television commercial, or if it is in response to a request for information or is automatically generated in response to Internet searches.</u></p> <p>[12] There is a potential for abuse <u>when a solicitation involves</u> inherent in direct in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact by a lawyer with <u>someone</u> a prospective client known to need legal services. These forms of contact between a lawyer and a prospective client subject the layperson <u>a person</u> to the private importuning of the trained advocate in a direct interpersonal encounter. The person prospective client, who may already feel overwhelmed by the circumstances giving rise to the need for legal services, may find it difficult fully to evaluate all available alternatives with reasoned judgment and appropriate self-interest in the face of the lawyer’s presence and insistence upon being retained immediately. The situation is fraught with the possibility of undue influence, intimidation, and over-reaching.</p>	
-------------------------	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>[23] This potential for abuse inherent in direct in-person, live telephone or realtime electronic solicitation of prospective clients justifies its prohibition, particularly since lawyers <u>have advertising and written and recorded communication permitted under Rule 7.2</u> offer alternative means of conveying necessary information to those who may be in need of legal services. <u>Advertising and written and recorded</u> In particular, <u>communications, can which may be mailed or autodialed or transmitted by email or other electronic means that do not involve real-time contact and do not violate other laws governing solicitations. These forms of communications and solicitations make it possible for the public a prospective client to be informed about the need for legal services, and about the qualifications of available lawyers and law firms, without subjecting the prospective client the public to direct in-person, telephone or real-time electronic persuasion that may overwhelm the client's a person's judgment.</u></p> <p>[34] The use of general advertising and written, recorded or electronic communications to transmit information from lawyer to <u>the public</u> prospective client, rather than direct in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact, will help to</p>	
--	--	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>assure that the information flows cleanly as well as freely. The contents of advertisements and communications permitted under Rule 7.2 can be permanently recorded so that they cannot be disputed and may be shared with others who know the lawyer. This potential for informal review is itself likely to help guard against statements and claims that might constitute false and misleading communications, in violation of Rule 7.1. The contents of direct in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic conversations between a lawyer and a prospective client <u>contact</u> can be disputed and may not be subject to third-party scrutiny. Consequently, they are much more likely to approach (and occasionally cross) the dividing line between accurate representations and those that are false and misleading.</p> <p>[45] There is far less likelihood that a lawyer would engage in abusive practices against an individual who is a former client, or <u>a person</u> with whom the lawyer has close personal or family relationship, or in situations in which the lawyer is motivated by considerations other than the lawyer's pecuniary gain. Nor is there a serious potential for abuse when the person contacted is a lawyer. Consequently, the</p>	
--	---	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>general prohibition in Rule 7.3(a) and the requirements of Rule 7.3(c) are not applicable in those situations. Also, paragraph (a) is not intended to prohibit a lawyer from participating in constitutionally protected activities of public or charitable legal-service organizations or bona fide political, social, civic, fraternal, employee or trade organizations whose purposes include providing or recommending legal services to its <u>their</u> members or beneficiaries.</p> <p>[56] But even permitted forms of solicitation can be abused. Thus, any solicitation which contains information which is false or misleading within the meaning of Rule 7.1, which involves coercion, duress or harassment within the meaning of Rule 7.3(b)(2), or which involves contact with a prospective client <u>someone</u> who has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer within the meaning of Rule 7.3(b)(1) is prohibited. Moreover, if after sending a letter or other communication to a client as permitted by Rule 7.2 the lawyer receives no response, any further effort to communicate with the <u>recipient of the communication</u> prospective client may violate the provisions of Rule 7.3(b).</p>	
--	--	--

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>[67] This Rule is not intended to prohibit a lawyer from contacting representatives of organizations or groups that may be interested in establishing a group or prepaid legal plan for their members, insureds, beneficiaries or other third parties for the purpose of informing such entities of the availability of and details concerning the plan or arrangement which the lawyer or lawyer's firm is willing to offer. This form of communication is not directed to <u>people who are seeking legal services for themselves</u>. a prospective client. Rather, it is usually addressed to an individual acting in a fiduciary capacity seeking a supplier of legal services for others who may, if they choose, become prospective clients of the lawyer. Under these circumstances, the activity which the lawyer undertakes in communicating with such representatives and the type of information transmitted to the individual are functionally similar to and serve the same purpose as advertising permitted under Rule 7.2.</p>	
<p>8.5 (disciplinary authority; choice of law) Addition to comment</p>	<p>[5] When a lawyer's conduct involves significant contacts with more than one jurisdiction, it may not be clear whether the predominant effect of the lawyer's conduct will occur in a jurisdiction other than the one in which the conduct occurred. So long as the lawyer's conduct conforms to the</p>	<p>No, because Arizona did not adopt comment 5 to MR 5.5. The additional language also merely identifies an additional permissive factor that tribunals may consider when determining which jurisdiction's law to apply in a disciplinary proceeding</p>

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

	<p>rules of a jurisdiction in which the lawyer reasonably believes the predominant effect will occur, the lawyer shall not be subject to discipline under this Rule. <u>With respect to conflicts of interest, in determining a lawyer's reasonable belief under paragraph (b)(2), a written agreement between the lawyer and client that reasonably specifies a particular jurisdiction as within the scope of that paragraph may be considered if the agreement was obtained with the client's informed consent confirmed in the agreement.</u></p>	
Model Rule on Admission on Motion	<p>Primary change: lower the active-practice requirement to three of the five preceding years, from five of the preceding seven years. Arizona's Rule 34(f)(1)(C) requires that applicants have been primarily engaged in the active practice of law for five of the previous seven years.</p>	No pending rule-change petition
Model Rule on In House Counsel Registration.	<p>Primary change: allow lawyers admitted only in a foreign jurisdiction to register as in-house counsel and adds restrictions, such as requiring foreign lawyers to provide advice on U.S. law only in conjunction with a U.S. lawyer. Arizona's Rule 38(h) already allows foreign lawyers to register as in-house counsel and practice here, without the restriction of working in conjunction with a U.S. lawyer.</p>	No pending rule-change petition

Model Rule changes resulting from ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 compared to proposed Arizona rule changes

Model Rule on Pro Hac Vice.	Primary change: allow lawyers admitted only in a foreign jurisdiction to apply to appear pro hac vice, as long as the lawyer is associated with local counsel who also would advise the client on substantive U.S. law. Arizona's Rule 38(a) limits pro hac vice admission to lawyers who are members of "the bar of another state or eligible to practice before the highest court in any state, territory or insular possession of the United States," among other requirements.	No pending rule-change petition
New Model Rule on Practice Pending Admission	An out-of-state lawyer who meets certain criteria could establish a systematic and continuous presence in a jurisdiction for up to one year while the lawyer seeks to become admitted in the jurisdiction.	No pending rule-change petition